



Applicants' traversal is based upon the belief that examination of all of claims 1-39 would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner. For example, a search for vibration control systems, as recited in claims 1-23, 25-27, 30-32, 36 and 37 (Group I), would produce art, if any, relating to vibration control systems, as recited in claims 28, 38 and 39 (Group II). Similarly, such a search would produce art, if any, relating to vibration control systems, as recited in claim 29 (Group III). Further, such a search would produce art, if any, relating to vibration control systems, as recited in claims 24 and 33-35 (Group IV).

Section 803 of the M.P.E.P. states that if a search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine the entire application on the merits. In the present case, Applicants submit that no serious burden exists since one search would reveal art relating to vibration control systems. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the restriction requirement in view of the foregoing remarks. If the Examiner believes that a conversation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Applicants believe that no fee is due with this filing. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fee that may be due to Deposit Account No. 20-0531.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeremy P. Oczek
Attorney for Applicants
TESTA, HURWITZ, & THIBEAULT, LLP
125 High Street, High Street Tower
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Date: May 3, 2002
Reg. No. 50,794

Tel. No.: (617) 310-8158
Fax No.: (617) 248-7100

RECEIVED
MAY - 8 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700